



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/777,668

02/13/2004

Kil-soo Jung

1293.1900C3

5886

49455 7590 03/18/2009

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP
1400 EYE STREET, NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

FABER, DAVID

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/18/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/777,668	Applicant(s) JUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner DAVID FABER	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/12/05, 2/13/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the application filed on 13 February 2004 and the Information Disclosure Statements filed on 13 February 2004 and 12 December 2005.

This office action is made Non-Final.

2. Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 10, and 26 are independent claims.

Priority

3. It is noted that this application appears to claim subject matter disclosed in prior Application No. 10/612415, filed 3 July 2003. A reference to the prior application must be inserted as the first sentence(s) of the specification of this application or in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.76), if applicant intends to rely on the filing date of the prior application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121, or 365(c). See 37 CFR 1.78(a). For benefit claims under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c), the reference must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) of all nonprovisional applications. If the application is a utility or plant application filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) on or after November 29, 2000, the specific reference to the prior application must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the actual filing date of the application or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. If the application is a utility or plant application which entered the national stage from an international application filed on or after November 29, 2000, after compliance with 35 U.S.C. 371, the specific reference must be submitted

Art Unit: 2178

during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the date on which the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. See 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and (a)(5)(ii). This time period is not extendable and a failure to submit the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 119(e) and/or 120, where applicable, within this time period is considered a waiver of any benefit of such prior application(s) under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). A benefit claim filed after the required time period may be accepted if it is accompanied by a grantable petition to accept an unintentionally delayed benefit claim under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). The petition must be accompanied by (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 120 or 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) to the prior application (unless previously submitted), (2) a surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t), and (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional. The petition should be addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

If the reference to the prior application was previously submitted within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 1.78(a), but not in the first sentence(s) of the specification or an application data sheet (ADS) as required by 37 CFR 1.78(a) (e.g., if the reference was submitted in an oath or declaration or the application transmittal letter), and the information concerning the benefit claim was recognized by the Office as shown by its inclusion on the first filing receipt, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a) and the surcharge

Art Unit: 2178

under 37 CFR 1.17(t) are not required. Applicant is still required to submit the reference in compliance with 37 CFR 1.78(a) by filing an amendment to the first sentence(s) of the specification or an ADS. See MPEP § 201.11.

4. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) based upon the applications filed in the Republic of Korea on 5 July 2002 and on 4 January 2003. A claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) cannot be based on said application, since the United States application was filed more than twelve months thereafter.

5. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on the applications filed in Republic of Korea on 5 July 2002 and on 4 January 2003. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 2002-38880 and 2003-436 applications as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Information Disclosure Statement

6. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 13 February 2004 and 12 December 2005 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

7. The drawings were received on 13 February 2004. These drawings are accepted.

Art Unit: 2178

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claims 1-3, and 10-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

For your reference, below is a section from MPEP 2105 :

(a) Functional Descriptive Material: "Data Structures" Representing Descriptive Material Per Se or Computer Programs Representing Computer Listings Per Se
Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.

Similarly, computer programs claimed as computer listings per se, i.e., the descriptions or expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. Accordingly, it is important to distinguish claims that define descriptive material per se from claims that define statutory inventions.

Computer programs are often recited as part of a claim. Office personnel should determine whether the computer program is being claimed as part of an otherwise statutory manufacture or machine. In such a case, the claim remains statutory irrespective of the fact that a computer program is included in the claim. The same result occurs when a computer program is used in a computerized process where the computer executes the instructions set forth in the computer program. Only when the claimed invention taken as a whole is directed to a mere program listing, i.e., to only its description or expression, is it descriptive material per se and hence nonstatutory.

Since a computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer, the computer program itself is not a process and Office personnel should treat a claim for a computer program, without the computer-readable medium needed to realize the computer program's functionality, as nonstatutory functional descriptive material. When a computer program is claimed in a process where the computer is executing the

Art Unit: 2178

computer program's instructions, Office personnel should treat the claim as a process claim. See paragraph IV.B.2(b), below. When a computer program is recited in conjunction with a physical structure, such as a computer memory, Office personnel should treat the claim as a product claim.

10. Claims 1, 10, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 10, and 26 disclose an apparatus; however, the claims fail to disclose if this apparatus indicates any hardware therefore the apparatus is representing a data structure. Thus, Claims 1-3, and 10-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claim lacks the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process (i.e. a signal) nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material per se. Therefore, the claims appear to be claiming "software systems" i.e. systems without hardware indication, which is a computer program per se. Since the claims disclose computer program per se that is not embodied on a computer readable medium, they appear non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

Art Unit: 2178

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

12. Claims 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lamkin et al. (hereinafter Lamkin), U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0088011 A1, filed 7/2/2001, provisional filing 7/7/2000 (cited via Applicant's IDS).

As per independent claim 4, Lamkin discloses a system comprising:

- A data storage medium (FIG 2, 204)
- an apparatus to reproduce AV data recorded on the data storage medium in an interactive mode using a mark-up document corresponding to the AV data;
(Abstract; Paragraph 0035, 0039, 0063, 0066, 0068, 0174, 0224: Discloses a DVD (a storage medium) containing AV data, and including HTML documents in directories to reproduce said AV data in an interactive mode (a DVD video content and HTML content with extra information regarding said video encoded on said DVD, playable via computer connected to the Internet).
- a display device to display a mark-up screen obtained using the mark-up document with an AV screen obtained by reproducing the AV data, wherein the AV screen is embedded in the mark-up screen.(FIG 1 item 138 discloses a display device that displays the HTML document and DVD content (FIG 2; Paragraph 0103-0104, wherein Lamkin discloses embedding AV content with the HTML document (Paragraph 0117, 0121-0124)

As per dependent claim 5 and 6, Lamkin discloses the interactive mode is a display mode in which the AV data is reproduced, displayed in a display window defined by the mark-up document and wherein the AV screen is a screen displayed on the display device when reproducing the AV data, and the mark-up screen is a screen displayed on the display unit when interpreting the mark-up document. (Paragraph 0063, 0066; FIG 1, 2)

As per dependent claim 7, Lamkin discloses a parental level setting button or an on-screen display menu to enable the user to set a parental level (Paragraph 0130: Discloses commands that can be used by the calling application, i.e. HTML document to initiate a DVD/CD playback functions. Thus, the user can call the to display the HTML document, a form of a menu to set the parental level (Page 11, Right Column, "ParentalLevelSelect(n)" command))

As per dependent claim 8, Lamkin discloses wherein the apparatus to reproduce the AV data receives data from and transmits the data through a network. (FIG 1, 2, Paragraph 0068)

As per dependent claim 9, Lamkin wherein the mark-up document comprises an application program to reproduce the AV data in the interactive mode and contains interactive contents to be displayed on the display device together with the AV data. (FIG 1, 2, Paragraph 0063-0068)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 1-3, and 10-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamkin et al. (hereinafter Lamkin), U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0088011 A1, filed 7/2/2001, provisional filing 7/7/2000 (cited via Applicant's IDS), in view of Berstis et al. (hereinafter Berstis), U.S. Patent No. 6,510,458 filed 7/15/1999.

As per independent claim 1, Lamkin et al discloses an apparatus comprising:

- A reader reading the mark-up document and AV data from the data storage medium; and an AV decoder the AV data. (Abstract; Paragraph 0035, 0039, 0063, 0066, 0068, 0174, 0224: Discloses a DVD (a storage medium) containing AV data, and including HTML documents in directories to reproduce said AV data in an interactive mode (a DVD video content and HTML content with extra information regarding said video encoded on said DVD, playable via computer connected to the Internet)
- A blender blending a mark-up document interpreted by the presentation engine and an AV screen obtained by producing the AV data (Paragraph 0153-0154: Disclose blending the HTML page and video)

Lamkin discloses identifying parental level values (Page 11, Right Column, “ParentalLevelSelect(n)” command); however, fail to specifically disclose a presentation engine identifying a predetermined value of an element of the mark-up document and determining whether to display the element depending on the predetermined value and to display rule information. However, Berstis teaches Web filtering of a web page whereby a user selectable ratings service (such as parental levels) is used to rate Web content, screening objectionable content, therefore blocking transmission, etc wherein these set predetermined values determine which elements, content and other information of the Web page to be displayed . (Berstis Abstract, column 12 lines 5-10, 13-18, column 13 lines 15-20, 25-46, 54-59, column 18 lines 44-48, Figures 6-9). It is additionally noted that Berstis teaches that HTTP is a known protocol for transferring data files (e.g. text, audio, motion video, etc.) (Berstis column 6 lines 35-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Berstis to Lamkin, providing Lamkin the benefit of restricting objectionable content for greater parental control (i.e. providing customized HTML content in Lamkin’s directories accordingly, based on Berstis’s parental level (rules) selection). (see Berstis column 13 lines 16-20, 47-53).

As per dependent claim 2 and 3, Lamkin discloses the display rule information is written according to CSS rules and in form of a CSS file. (Paragraph 0124: Discloses a stylesheet (i.e. CSS))

As per independent claim 10, Claim 10 recites similar limitation as in Claim 1, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 11, Claim 11 recites similar limitation as in Claim 1, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 12, Claim 12 recites similar limitation as in Claim 1, and is similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Lamkin discloses embedding AV content with the HTML document (Paragraph 0117, 0121-0124)

As per dependent claim 13, Lamkin discloses plug-ins (Paragraph 0220)

As per dependent claim 14, Lamkin discloses the controller retrieves data and the mark-up document through a network. (FIG 1, 2, Paragraph 0068)

As per dependent claims 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, Lamkin teaches DVD data and DVD-video and DVD-audio standards (FIG 2; Paragraph 0080) and an API (Lamkin paragraph [0051]); and setting parental levels (Page 11, Right Column, "ParentalLevelSelect(n)"). However, Lamkin does not specifically teach parental levels meeting DVD standards or ratings. However, Berstis teaches RSAC, a ratings service for computer games (typically distributed on CD or DVD, as well as MPAA for movies (typically on DVDs) (Berstis column 13 lines 15-20, 40-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Berstis to Lamkin, providing Lamkin the benefit of a standard ratings system for increased ratings consistency and ratings for parental control.

In addition, Lamkin teaches a common HTML page (index.htm) in a directory named "common" (a form of startup document) (Lamkin paragraph [0075]). However, Lamkin does not specifically teach meta-information. However, Berstis teaches HTML meta-information associated with parental levels (Berstis column 10 lines 10-19). It

Art Unit: 2178

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Berstis to Lamkin, providing Lamkin the benefit of meta-data to more accurately describe parental data.

Furthermore, Lumpkin teaches a DVD (a storage medium) containing AV data, and including HTML documents in directories to reproduce said AV data in an interactive mode (Lamkin Abstract, paragraph [0035], [0039], [0066], [0068]) and setting a parental level (Page 11, Right Column, "ParentalLevelSelect(n)"). Lamkin does not specifically teach displaying pages according to a parental level, or link information according to a parental level. However, Berstis teaches specifying which sites (HTML pages) a user is allowed to see, based on a selected parental level (Berstis Figure 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Berstis's levels to Lamkin's HTML selection, providing Lamkin the benefit of selecting which HTML page to view based on parental levels.

As per dependent claim 21, Claim 21 recites similar limitations as in Claim 10 and is similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore Lamkin teaches an index.htm file for general information and general AV, said file typically stored in a "root" directory (Lamkin paragraph [0075]). In addition, Lamkin teaches various directories (i.e. directories and subdirectories) storing both DVD content and HTML content accordingly (Lamkin paragraph [0035]).

As per dependent claim 22, Lamkin fails to specifically disclose wherein the link information comprises mark-up document information indicating the parental level set by the user for the apparatus to reproduce the data. However, Berstis teaches specifying which sites (HTML pages) a user is allowed to see, based on a selected parental level (Berstis Figure 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Berstis's levels to Lamkin's HTML selection, providing Lamkin the benefit of selecting which HTML page (via links) to view based on parental levels.

As per dependent claims 23-25, Lamkin discloses a stylesheet (i.e. CSS) and a scripting language (Paragraph 0124)

As per independent claim 26, Claim 26 recites similar limitation as in Claim 10, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 27, Claim 27 recites similar limitation as in Claim 19, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 28, Claim 28 recites similar limitations as in Claim 16, and is similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Lamkin discloses the parent level value range is from 1-8 (Page 11, Right Column, "ParentalLevelSelect(n)")

As per dependent claim 29, Lamkin discloses HTML documents that contain live web links (i.e. URL) to other media stored on the Internet, an actor's web site or the HTML document is linked to an ITX web site (Paragraph 0066, 0068, 0070, and Claim 15). However, Lamkin fails to specifically disclose accessing more one or more URLs according to the set parent level. However, Berstis teaches specifying which sites

Art Unit: 2178

(HTML pages) a user is allowed to see, based on a selected parental level (Berstis Figure 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Berstis's levels to Lamkin's HTML selection, providing Lamkin the benefit of selecting which HTML page (via links) to view based on parental levels.

Double Patenting

15. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

16. Claims 1-29 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 7,493,552.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are substantially similar in scope and they use the same

Art Unit: 2178

limitations, using varying terminology. Both applications disclose displaying documents along with reproducing AV data in an interactive mode according to a parental level.

17. Claims 1-29 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of copending Application No. 10777758. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are substantially similar in scope and they use the same limitations, using varying terminology. Both applications disclose displaying documents along with reproducing AV data in an interactive mode according to a parental level.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

18. Claims 1-29 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of copending Application No. 10777900. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are substantially similar in scope and they use the same limitations, using varying terminology. Both applications disclose displaying documents along with reproducing AV data in an interactive mode according to a parental level.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Lamkin et al US 2002/0078144 Published 6/20/2002

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Faber whose telephone number is 571-272-2751. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8am to 430pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/David Faber/
Examiner, Art Unit 2178

	/CESAR B PAULA/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178
--	--

Application/Control Number: 10/777,668
Art Unit: 2178

Page 17